

Cut Through, July 9, 2026: **Karl Stefanovic and the death of the TV star**

All timestamps are approximate

Karl singing to Dolly Parton (00:00)

When I met you there was peace unknown I set out to get you, with a finetooth comb I was soft inside. There was something going on.

Dolly Parton

Well...

Crystal Andrews (00:17)

Hello and welcome to Cut Through, Crikey's spin-free analysis of Australian news, politics and power. I'm your host, Crystal Andrews, and I'm here with Tina Quinn.

Crikey contributor and host of Fourth Estate on 2SER to discuss the rise and fall question mark, I guess, of Karl Stefanovic and what it says about the wider media industry. Tina, welcome to Cut Through. I'm so glad to have you here and have this conversation with you.

Tina Quinn (00:45.074)

Fantastic. I'm so glad I get to I'm so glad you it's so nice of you to return the favor after a week apart. We've we were already chatting about this last week.

Crystal Andrews (00:53.386)

It is. If anyone listens to this and has not had enough of this conversation, I was on Fourth Estate last week and you can listen to that as well on all the podcast platforms. So I answered the questions then. You A you can answer

Tina Quinn (01:05.986)

I know now I'm a little bit nervous. I'm so much I'm so much more comfortable in your chair, so this is so be go easy on me.

Crystal Andrews (01:14.074)

It's a real, it's a real turning the tables moment. But, you know, we're here for a purpose because you've written an incredibly comprehensive piece for Crikey about Karl Stefanovic's career, you know, going back to the very beginning. I've read the 5,500-word draft of the piece. And there when this episode is live, there'll be a somewhat shorter version of that published on the Crikey website. You spoke to an enormous number of

sources who, you know, worked with Karl at Nine in various capacities from, you know, quite junior sort of producers to on screen talent all the way up to management staff at quite senior levels, in fact. So without giving anything away, did you find yourself surprised by some of the things that the people that you spoke to for this story told you? Like w how did you walk away after having had so many conversations about this? What was your feeling?

Tina Quinn (02:06.414)

yeah, I was surprised by how many people were willing to talk. I mean, when it started, when I started on the piece, and I sometimes, as you probably well know, the piece that you originally start out writing isn't always the piece that you end up submitting. It can try it can sort of go into a different direction. but I did know that I wanted to really look back at Stefanovic's early beginnings and

get a sense of what he was like, you know, coming up through the newsroom, and and through nine, the the broadcaster that made him. And, you know, there was certain I remember one particular person who was extremely senior at nine in in in management at at one point. and when I first called this person, I mean they said, look, I even if you know it's on background and this is, you know, I I speak to you anonymously

I still don't really yeah, I just don't want to get involved. I just don't wanna really get involved. You know, I've left nine, I've walked away from all that. And we kept chatting and an hour later, we were still chatting and they were sort of giving me certain contacts of certain people that they thought would be useful to this story. And every time, every phone call I made, the same thing kept happening. I mean, some were willing to speak.

right off the bat, some took a little bit of coaxing and persuading, but every time they ended up being quite long conversations, with people that had a lot to say. You know, I thought this would maybe take me a couple of days to write, but it took I much longer. Yeah, I was getting sources left, right and centre. And yeah, so it was it was quite surprising. It

Crystal Andrews (03:55.522)

I think for anyone in the media industry, of which I know there's quite a few that listen to this podcast, it is absolutely a a must-read piece because at least from my, you know, reading, there are kind of two parallel stories in the one article. Firstly, it is about Karl's trajectory as an individual, you know, someone who rose to the absolute pinnacle of Australian television and Australian mainstream media. And at the same time, there is another story that

you know, runs perfectly alongside this about the evolution and decline, I think, of the Australian TV industry itself. So we'll try to kind of tackle both aspects in today's conversation. I think first we should start with Karl. I mean, he is he is the draw card here. So if you had to kind of sum up the overall narrative about him and his career that you took away from these conversations with, you know, former colleagues in management, what would that be?

Tina Quinn (04:49.624)

Karl Stefanovic was very much a product of both the time he came up in and the industry as a whole. Someone actually said to me that Karl is who he is now and where he's at in his career. he's because someone had actually put to me at one point that he had lost all integrity and that all journalistic integrity and he

was a a very far cry from the person that had started out in the industry. Someone else responded to that and said, he is a product of of the industry that made him. He is he he he did his best to fit that mold. And he did it well for a long time. He's been, you know, I classified, I guess, as good honor talent. he for some years was a ratings winner. Obviously nine have invested a lot in him over the years. They

They clearly saw him as an investment. But overall, I guess, walking away my impression of Karl, and this really does go back to his early days, words and descriptors that kept coming up to describe him were lazy, very good at sucking up to management, or the the people that it would seem would be advantageous to him. There was one junior producer I spoke to who worked with him.

25 years ago at Nine Brisbane, who said he never even bothered to learn my name. He used to just call me Copy Girl. Copy refers to the script, it refers to the words. So, you know, copy girl. So she would maybe write his copy for him or run copy to him. there were always producers who were helping him a lot behind the scenes, if not news directors and chief of staff. So I spoke to his first chief of staff in Sydney at

at nine, who said that he he helped him a lot. He in terms of, you know, he said he he was very green when he arrived. he'd often come in, it would seem not having listened to the news or not really being across the day story. So he said it was up to me to give him a bit of a brief, you know. And I've look, I've worked in television newsrooms and radio newsrooms, I've worked in all sorts of newsrooms. From my experience in T V newsrooms, you you tended to listen to the radio on the way in to work and

Tina Quinn (07:15.202)

You'd want to catch the latest news bulletins to make sure you were across your beat or or the remish or or have sort of some some sort of semblance of what was what was going on. It seemed he would often arrive underprepared, but he was kind of a personality hire. Now there were a few executives roaming around at the time that didn't think that, and one in particular said to me he he very quickly got a a halo, and an aura about him that really wasn't deserved. He wasn't a gr he wasn't a great reporter overall. But he was good on air, reasonably good looking, had a twinkle in his eye, and

The industry was shifting when he came along. You know, and and that's what it was more personality higher over serious news credo.

Crystal Andrews (08:20.306)

Yeah, there was some some quotes that I mean if if this remains in the in the final version that's live, I'm I'm sure everybody listening will find out. And if not, you've you've got a little glimpse of the draft here. But some quotes that really took me from a former chief of staff who was like my little baby. He was very good for the newsroom because as you as you mentioned, he was always happy, he was smiling, he was always joking around, he lifted spirits in the newsroom. was he the best reporter? No, he wasn't.

But he was earmarked quite early on for big things. There was something else that I found quite interesting in the piece. Is it right he had nine different co hosts all female over his period on the show? Does that sound something in that vicinity?

Tina Quinn (09:36.556)

Let me just it's either eight or nine. Tracy Grimshaw, Jessica Rowe, Sarah Murdoch, and Kelly Connolly, now Kelly Sloan, the leader of the New South Wales Liberals. Lisa Wilkinson, of course. Georgie Gardner, Alison Langdon, Sarah Arbo. So I've counted eight.

Crystal Andrews (09:52.2)

So there was a little a little break in that time, but he was a fixture throughout. And also along that time frame, you write about the sort of waxing and waning ratings of nine sort of chasing sevens number one rated sunrise for much of that time. But it was interesting to me that it seemed because of that boys culture, because of the people that Karl had all allied himself with on his rise, his

Tina Quinn (09:55.213)

A year. Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (10:20.91)

presence never appeared to be questioned or examined as the source of why there might be a ratings drop, why there might be, you know, might why it might need to be a shake up. It was always the female co-host that would be rotated.

Tina Quinn (10:32.854)

found this really remarkable, right? He was such a protected species. I mean, even when he was taken off air for a year because his public image and brand at that time was deemed toxic, nine didn't fire him. They just took him off the Today show and sort of rested him and kept paying him this exorbitant two million dollar salary. And then, you know, after you know, the ratings really nosedived and it clearly wasn't working with Georgie Gardner and and Deborah Knight, you know, he was brought back with Alison Langdon. But

Even going back as far as when he first ascended to the anchorship of the Today Show, he replaced Steve Leibman, who was a very different sort of character in in in television news. Leibman was considered a serious newsman. His most recent co-host, female co-host, was Tracy Grimshaw. They were together for 10 years, and it was a very different show. It was much more journalistically and news-driven.

There was always light and shade. there was always light banter between, you know, the the anchors and the co-hosts, but not to the extent that we would see now. When i in the early two thousands, you know, sunrise was really it was the new kid on the block, but it was really starting to nip at today's heels. they started to freak out. They were really reactive and they started going, We need to shake things up a bit. there was a source who

an on-air presenter who worked on the Today Show, who said to me that started actually during the Steve Liebman and Tracy Grimshaw years. They started getting those hosts to engage in like cooking segments and all this sort all sorts of stuff that they wouldn't have otherwise done before that they were kind of uncomfortable with. They were trying to shake up the format, make it lighter. Exactly. Make it a little bit lighter like Sunrise was a number of people say that, you know, it wasn't quite Steve Liebman's choice to step aside.

Crystal Andrews (12:13.336)

A little bit of

Tina Quinn (12:23.66)

But they decided they needed a fresher face. So enter Karl Stefanovic, who at that point was 30 years old. He sat beside Tracy Grimshaw, who had been doing the job for nearly 10 years. There was a little bit of an age gap of 14 years. She was 14 years older than him. there was a similar age gap between David Koch and Mel Doyle over at Sunrise, except that David Koch was 13 years older than Mel. And

Seven started circulating this joke that the Today Show is now hosted by Karl Stefanovic and his mum. because we're less yeah, we're less comfortable with the dynamic being reversed of an older woman and a and a younger man. And the ratings continued to slip. And his performance, originally TV critics called him wooden and a bit, you know, stiff, incapable of

really taking part in light on air banter on air with with Tracy, but they stuck with him. Tracy Grimshaw left the Today Show at the end of that year to take up the share a current affair. And they brought in Jessica Rowe. And Jessica Rowe arguably was actually, I would say a bit of a bigger star than Stefan Ovik at the time. A number of sources that I spoke to that worked at the Today Show around that time said, I always thought it was a bit of a strange

choice to choose her because she didn't have breakfast television pedigree and she, you know, didn't have the same sort of experience and this and that. And I just I just thought, but neither did Karl. Yeah. Breakf he had no he had no in some ways, I actually think you could argue she had more live experience because back then reporters out on the field did less live crosses than they do today. And she had been anchoring

a live bulletin for nearly 10 years. Now, anchoring a live bulletin is very different from hosting a a live breakfast show. You've got to show more of your personality on breakfast and that sort of stuff. she wasn't as experienced at doing that, but almost immediately the reviews, the first reviews of

Tina Quinn (14:32.184)

her on air performance, you know, sort of rolled in within days of her starting, and they were somewhat negative. There was also a lot of politics going on because there was a lot happening at Nine at the time Carrie Packer had passed away. The executive that basically hired Jessica

Rowe, whose choice it was to bring her over to Nine was a man named Sam Chisholm, who loomed very large at Nine for many years. He made a number of enemies, and there were other people within the Packers Channel Nine that were wanting things done their way.

if I think that's the best way of sort of putting it. Sam Chisholm did not stay at Nine particularly for for much longer. And John Alexander, who was then CEO of PBL, who who owned Nine, brought in Eddie Maguire as CEO. And very quickly it was made clear to me that they didn't particularly like Jessica Rowe. They saw her as the Sam Chisholm hire. And there was so much acrimony between Alexander and Chisholm that

They just didn't really want any any of Chisholm's pics to to remain. The media campaign became so out of control against Jessica Rowe. Like it was daily, weekly columns about her performance. They commented on her weight. She was too thin apparently. Her hair was too short. They didn't like the fact that she didn't have children. She admitted to the audience that, you know, she didn't like cooking. you know, and she's later made a brand out of that craphouse. Well, I know, right? I I know. It's

you know, we like our TV anchors. While they're obviously career women, we still want them to be domestic goddesses, I guess. The audience seemed to then pick up that they were obviously reading about in the papers and they were writing into nine every day. There were emails, floods of emails coming in complaining about her. She didn't speak to me for this piece, but she has since spoken about waking up one Sunday morning to see a headline with her picture saying, Is this Australia's most annoying

person or is this the most annoying person on on Australian television? And then Channel Nine's own current affair did a story asking the question, is this Australia's most annoying woman? Within Channel Nine? Like it's a network. This is your talent. Exactly. So it just became really clear that there was a campaign that was being driven with inside the network against her. She lasted twelve months. She was fired when she left to go on maternity leave.

Crystal Andrews (16:39.96)
Same network.

Tina Quinn (16:57.346)
And what strikes me about that speaking, there were a number of people that said, Look, she just wasn't the right fit. She just wasn't the right fit. She didn't have the same pedigree. She didn't have the same this, that, the the ratings, you know, really took a nosedive. It was a disaster. It was this, it was that. I just don't know why she wasn't given the same leniency that Karl Stefanovic was, and that he was continually given

Crystal Andrews (17:19.618)
There are some answers, I guess. Actually in the piece. So Yes, yeah, now now at the time it seems a mystery, but now it it is quite clear that he was well liked, well protected, a a bit of a special beast within the network, and had friends in very, very high places.

Well, he was exactly where he needed to be for his career and and it worked out very well for him for a very, very long time. But as, you know, he he did reach this this pinnacle and was one of the most famous men in television. At the time of his come up, I guess, you know, nine is in this incredibly strong position, dominating, you know, ratings, raking in the the advertising.

Tina Quinn (18:38.722)

Very lucrative.

Crystal Andrews (18:58.976)

You mention in the piece throwback to the still the one tagline.

Tina Quinn (19:06.782)

Yeah.

Nine "Still the One" 2003 (19:08.446)

You're still having fun and we're still the one.

Crystal Andrews (19:12.056)

But that was a very different television landscape to the one that we have now. And it has been changing for, I would say, you know, six or seven or eight years. Crikey's media correspondent Chris Warren has written a piece recently about just how dire the situation is for broadcast television networks, both on the sort of like cultural front and their relevance, but also on the financial front and how expensive TV is versus, you know, the the advertising dollars that are still available to that medium. How much did that cost?

come up in the conversations that you were having with people about Karl's career and the these like later stage changes and and how much was that did that that appear to people to be driving factor? Well

Tina Quinn (19:54.334)

Huge because I mean, as one person said, you know, and and there's a lot of people who might be sympathetic to the line that Karl is putting out there about free speech. And someone said to me it has nothing to do with free speech. It all comes down to advertising. they don't really care about driving a particular ideological line. They they care more about the sort of money they're raking in from advertisers. That's a huge part of that's that's their revenue stream, right?

Crystal Andrews (20:22.614)

That's the business, yeah.

Tina Quinn (20:23.82)

That's the business. I mean, in the early two thousands, when Karl was sort of rising through the ranks at Channel Nine, three hundred and eighty-six million dollars was the figure recorded within a six-month period. I think it was the six months to June of two thousand and two. yeah, it

was either two thousand and two or two thousand and one. That's how much they recorded in ad revenue. It was extraordinary. It was the halcyon days, right? And

The changing business model, I mean, yeah, that's I think a lot of broadcasters are really grappling with yes, their cultural relevance, but also the business model of how they can still keep funding their operation, you know. And I liken this to the studio system of Hollywood in the nineteen thirties and forties and fifties. And that also went through a huge revolution. But the studio system it was like

they were like these stables that had these great stars. They each had their own great stars and they were very protective of their stable of stars. It all really started to change with the introduction of the Ostam rating system in the early two thousands. And it was David Leckie, who was then Nine's CEO and managing director that introduced the system and he was really excited about the introduction of it. He, you know, kind of heralded it as this thing that was gonna really transform

you know, television ratings and and like nine was riding really high back then, right? They were the number one network. Channel seven was known as channel second. And when OSTAM was first introduced, it was a bit of a disaster because it actually showed Nine's ratings in a less favorable light. Some said that there were mass problems with its accuracy in the beginning and and that was part of what contributed to it. But

That was really damaging then to to Nine's, you know, still the one kind of image, public image, as as the number one broadcaster in Australia. And it continued to have rippling effects on the industry in ways that I think are still being felt today. So one news and current affairs director said to me, you know, when Ostam was released, that was when you went from getting weekly ratings of a program.

Tina Quinn (22:45.368)

to daily ratings. So each day you'd be getting what you'd rated the previous day. And it all started to become really reactive as a result. Like news and current affairs became so reactive. Because if there was a slip one day, how do we get it up the next? And what do we do? And it was you know, instead of sort of keeping calm and and and sti you know staying the course of quality television, quality news and current affairs, a quality product.

Because nine was known as out of all the commercial networks, it could deliver on a on on quite a intelligent news and current affairs product. Today's show was regarded as a good breakfast news program and all of that stuff. And from what I understand, what a number of people told me, it just really changed things because they all of a sudden became very stressed out about chasing daily ratings. And Ostam itself kept transforming and as it developed further.

you were able to get minute by minute ratings. You you were able to get minute by minute figures on how many people were tuning in at one time. And that was then completely disastrous. A current affair used to be a very different show to to what it is now. It wasn't so, you

know, consumer story driven and, you know, supermarkets ripping you off or chasing would-be criminal criminals down the street and all that sort of stuff. Dodgy mechanics, you know.

used to be a much more serious news outfit. They used to do much more serious current affairs programs. With the introduction of OSTAM, and then also as the industry was changing more and more, they tried to compete with Channel Sevens today, tonight. And they were chasing ratings. So they started transforming the show to mirror their more tabloid competitors. They would still have, you know, a sort of set piece interview with a hard hitting politician.

But those interviews became shorter, dealing with less complexity, were of they probably lessened the quality and the less they were probably less enlightening for the audience. You could see in the minute by minute viewership, the viewer numbers would go down when you know, John they'd start to drop off when John Howard would sit down and, you know, give an interview because there's a lot of there's a lot of viewers that aren't that interested in that kind of stuff.

Tina Quinn (25:04.808)

And so they were doing less and less of that hard hitting stuff because they were reacting to what they thought was their audience and what they thought their audience wanted. And overall, that just kept eroding the quality of the product over time. Standards kept slipping and slipping. And that that stretches to the Today Show. There was many former Today Show staffers that that spoke to that as well, how the introduction of Oz Tam completely transformed the industry for the work.

Crystal Andrews (25:30.786)

You can follow this right through to today. You can really be a slave to the metrics, regardless of platform. You know, that goes for people who are publishing on YouTube, on social media, on, you know, people with newsletter publications or blogs or what have you. Like you can you can really get sucked into the minutiae of

Tina Quinn (25:48.878)

And we do it, right? We still do it. I mean to an extent. We we we're always trying to think of what the you know, I you know, I I host a radio show and that radio show is podcasted. I'm always trying to think of really punchy titles for for my episode that's gonna be eye catching, you know, in the pod in in podcast feeds that that's gonna make people stop. I'm thinking about the topics within reason. I still y want to cover and I'm lucky I have the freedom to cover what I think is important. But you

Crystal Andrews (25:51.074)

Lightly.

Tina Quinn (26:18.22)

You do have audience in the back of your mind. You do have metrics in the back of your mind. But, you know, you and I are just a little bit luckier that we're not as, you know, like these big

commercial networks. I mean, they really are slaves to the metrics in ways that we couldn't possibly even imagine given the budgets that are on the line for them.

Crystal Andrews (26:37.448)

Absolutely. And, you know, it is interesting, I think, where this what the state of play is now that it can simultaneously be true that nine have let Karl Stefanovic go in part because of the reputational damage to the network, and that jeopardizing their relationship with advertisers, while at the same time, Karl is pursuing his own independent show, you know, published primarily primarily on platforms like YouTube, because there is more.

More money to be made there, an audience to be had there that he feels has a greater uncapped potential for him. we had a reader question that I would just love to put to you, Tina, in reference to the prospect of a show with Karl Stefanovic and Kyle Sanderlands, questioning what audience that would appeal to, or more importantly, which sponsors would that appeal to? You know, obviously Karl has been on a very big salary for a long time.

Do we think that there is enough money out there in the new media ecosystem for Karl to, you know, not only kind of run his show, but match the kind of dollar figures that he's been been used to and that he has his name has been essential in securing for a for a network like night?

Tina Quinn (27:52.672)

In the Australian market, I mean, my first response would be no. Our market is very different to the US market and the UK market. They're much bigger markets. given the damage, the sort of reputational damage that Karl has done to his own brand, as one person said to me, Polite Society is kind of closing the door to him, right? And given the people that are going on his show,

that he's platforming, there's gonna be a lot of sponsors that don't want will not want a bar of this. They, you know, this this brand is toxic. That's not the only way that you, as you actually quite astutely pointed out on my show, that's not the only way you can make money out of a podcast or a a YouTube show. But it does, I mean, someone else said to me it does take a long time to start making money off off of YouTube, for instance, through, through viewership and because they do have a

Crystal Andrews (28:50.634)

The rates the the rates are not yeah, y you have to have and you know, we should absolutely say Karl does so far have a very big audience there and he's getting, you know, i very impressive views. You you have to have a surprisingly gigantic audience to be making good money on on YouTube. It's not yeah, I think when you when you see some of the the ad rates on the back end per thousand views, they're not as generous as as people might think.

Tina Quinn (29:18.644)

Certainly not as generous as his bosses at nine were to him for so many years. But no. Look, I've also heard a few people have said that they have it on very good authority that Gina

Reinhardt is contributing somewhat to Karl's new podcast. that's something I've heard from multiple people. That wouldn't surprise me. She has shown a

an appetite for getting involved in these sorts of culture wars and helping support these sort of culture wars continuing

Crystal Andrews (29:56.214)

And media in general. She's she's had a few goes at investing in in media and she's certainly interested in that, in putting her money there, that's for sure.

Tina Quinn (30:05.984)

You you need to look back at at the history of media proprietors over decades upon decades throughout time across the world and the way that certain operators and certain practitioners, certain proprietors, the way they treat media ownership, sometimes in a very interventionist way, and as a way to also reflect their own cultural and ideological view of the world. and to also sometimes

I guess provide certain market advantages to to their own business and economic interests. I think Mrs. Reinhardt could possibly see some opportunities here for herself.

Crystal Andrews (30:46.798)

Opportunities to be had. I I think my last question on this story is whether we'll ever see a TV star like Karl Stefanovic and the others in his generation of television personalities, are we ever going to see that type of penetration and significance ever again? Like is this era of Australian television over and the door is shut for the you know, the millennials and

Gen Z who might have once upon a time been dreaming of a career like Karl.

Tina Quinn (31:19.596)

Yeah, I see, I think about this a lot. And I because the I mean, the business model has changed so much. It's made our media much more fragmented. That doesn't mean that we don't have big personalities that are breaking out across the landscape. On a television network, I mean, is it gonna be big stars created by the big television anchor job? Possibly not. But will there still be stars of news and current affairs and journalism and

yeah, I think we'll we'll continue to see that, but it just might not be I mean, we're as I said, we are already seeing that, but it's just it's playing out differently. And in some ways there's much more democracy, it's much more democratic because people are finding all sorts of different ways into the industry. We've got so much more choice now of where to get our news, where to consume our media from. It's not just up to three commercial networks and two public broadcasters. But

You know, part of the success of those those journalists and and those programs was the vast majority of the population w were all getting together at the same time, in a sense, sitting down in front of the television at the same time to watch these people.

Crystal Andrews (32:31.884)

A shared household experience as well, like across generations too, you know, absolutely. Whereas now you're you're consuming your own screen for your own interests.

Tina Quinn (32:41.282)

Completely. I mean you you know, you could be watching something on your phone in the same apartment as your partner who's watching something on their laptop and you're consuming completely different media platforms and yeah, something completely different on your screen, right? At the same time. I mean, you know, in those days, most households had one television set. If one person really wanted to watch something, that meant the you know, the entire household was so captive to it, right? So

It just meant more eyeballs on the same thing, on the same person at the same time. Do I still think stars will be created out of media, out of news, out of current affair, out of journalism? Yes. but it's gonna look very different. And the other big difference there is that the well, the cultivating of public images isn't going to be as controlled as a result. Yeah. Because some of these individuals are making a go out of a

making a go of it on their own and they're cultivating their own images and they're not leaving it up to management who are employing the tactics of, you know, public relations specialists and spin doctors.

Crystal Andrews (33:50.744)

Politics and the you know, pull pushing this person forward and pulling someone else back. Yeah, it it is a whole, you know, a whole new landscape for everybody listening and watching. If you have a tip of who's gonna be the next big media star, please let us know in the comments. I would love to I'd love to know what people think about that actually.

Tina Quinn (34:09.121)

It's gonna be Crystal Andrews, just quietly. I've got a hot tip. That's my hot tip.

Crystal Andrews (34:12.35)

You know what? I I I am flattered and I disagree. Tina, before we sign off for this episode, we wanna take a quick run at our new segment, Snooping with Cochon. Cochon is Crikey's tips hog who is always on the lookout for juicy tidbits and curiosities to investigate further. would you have anything that you would like to bring to the pig and our audience's attention?

Tina Quinn (34:17.761)

Yeah.

Tina Quinn (34:39.094)

Yeah, I'd really I mean look, I know I just mentioned it, but I'd really like the pig to do some dirty work for me and see if we can find anything else that might point to how much Mrs. Reinhardt might be helping out Karlos and his new podcast venture.

Crystal Andrews (34:59.394)

I can confirm Koshon is very interested in that. And if anybody knows anything about that, you can always tip Crikey off. I'll put all the details in the episode description. But for now, Tina, thank you so much for walking me through this mammoth story. I really appreciate your time today and your work on this.

Tina Quinn (35:16.302)

Thank you so much, I appreciate you asking me on.

Crystal Andrews (35:19.538)

if you enjoyed this episode of Cut Through, please don't forget to subscribe and leave a rating or review for the podcast. Crikey is one hundred percent independent, which means your support powers our journalism.